

## **Design Review Board**

---



### *Minutes*

**January 13, 2015  
Council Chambers – Lower Level  
57 East 1<sup>st</sup> Street  
4:30 PM**

A work session of the Design Review Board was held at the City of Mesa Council Chamber – Lower Level, 57 East 1<sup>st</sup> Street at 4:30 p.m.

#### **Board Members Present:**

Eric Paul – Chair  
Brian Sandstrom – Vice Chair  
Greg Lambright  
Taylor Candland

#### **Board Members Absent:**

Nicole Thompson  
Tracy Roedel  
Sean Banda

#### **Staff Present:**

John Wesley  
Angelica Guevara  
Lesley Davis  
Kim Steadman  
Wahid Alam  
Kaelee Wilson  
Mike Gildenstern

#### **Others Present:**

Mike Withey  
Bob Magness  
Zac Koceja  
Reese Anderson

Eric Paul, welcomed everyone to the Work Session at 4:42.

- A. **Discuss and Provide Direction Regarding Design Review cases:**

## **Design Review Board – Work Session Minutes January 13<sup>th</sup>, 2015**

### **Item A.1. DR15-001 Higley Heights**

NWC of Higley and Brown Roads. (District 5). Review of the proposed housing product of new subdivision. Andy Baron, KB Home, applicant; Eric Kough, KB Home, owner. (PLN2014-00634)

**Staff Planner: Angelica Guevara**

### **Discussion:**

Staff member, Angelica Guevara, presented the case to the Board.

Boardmember Lambright:

- Concerned about the long, flat walls on some of the models
- Concerned about a change of color when still on the same plane
- Concerned that the rear elevation is very broad, and unpunctuated

Chairperson Paul:

- Mentioned that massing is something that must be evaluated, especially in the row house model
- Was concerned about actual usability of proposed side yards
- Concerned that when hip roof is on one side, and a gable on the other, it presents an awkward situation

Brian Sandstrom:

- Questioned why only the Craftsman model had stone accents, and the rest of the models only have stucco
- Concerned that one model has been dressed up, while other models only have colored stucco, wanted more creative options
- Clarified that when satellite dishes are installed, architectural guidelines confine them to be placed in the rear yard, but federal regulations have limited what an HOA can regulate

**Design Review Board – Work Session Minutes  
January 13<sup>th</sup>, 2015**

**Item A.2. DR15-002 Metro East Valley Commerce Center**

The 500 through 800 blocks of East Auto Center Drive, (north side). Located east of Mesa Drive on the south side of the Superstition Freeway (21.5± acres). (District 3). Review of a proposed commerce park. (PLN2014-00638)

**Staff Planner: Kim Steadman**

**Discussion:**

Staff member Kim Steadman presented the case to the Board.

Boardmember Lambright:

- Suggested illuminating buildings at night with colored lighting
- Suggested creating visual interest at entry areas with overhangs, colored facias, and/or an accent color
- Commented that building was nicely proportioned

Chairperson Paul:

- Confirmed with applicant that towers on the corners are design features as well as potentially vertically expandable space for future tenants
- Confirmed that vision glass rises to a certain height to spandrel glass, which would be removed and replaced with vision glass depending on tenant requirements
- Concerned about long unbroken south elevation, but confirmed with architect that there would be additional architectural elements added to increase visual interest

Boardmember Sandstrom:

- Confirmed with applicant that interior rooflines are at a minimum 30', with additional height depending on roofline variations. Roof would cap out at roughly 42' in maximum height
- Proposed adding mezzanine to building for future use, and confirmed that the neighbors are supportive of the project

**Design Review Board – Work Session Minutes**  
**January 13<sup>th</sup>, 2015**

**Item A.3. DR15-003 Salad and Go**

5259 East Brown Road (District 5). Review of the proposed drive-thru restaurant with outdoor seating. Alta Mesa Salad, LLC applicant/owner. (PLN2014-00644)

**Staff Planner: Kaelee Wilson**

**Discussion:**

Staff member Kaelee Wilson presented the case to the Board.

Chairperson Paul:

- Suggested that the tile banding shouldn't be flush with the rest of the building
- Concerned about the mass and heaviness of the roof
- Confirmed that the queuing lanes are adequate

Chairperson Lambright:

- Concerned about the bulky mass of the canopy, suggested a lighter-appearing canopy wrapping around the front and the two sides
- Suggested distinguishing masses of the building, possibly pulling the wrap-around canopy forward a foot or two
- Suggested that when different materials are used, they must be in two different planes
- Proposed enlarging the columns

**Design Review Board – Work Session Minutes  
January 13<sup>th</sup>, 2015**

**Item A.4. DR15-004 Specialty Devices Inc. Plant Expansion**

4558 East Virginia Street. Located east of Greenfield Road and north of McDowell Road (20.2± acres). (District 5). Review of proposed industrial expansion. Bobby L. Magness, Weiss Magness Arch., applicant; Bob Daigneautt, Special Devices, Inc., owner. (PLN2014-00671)

**Staff Planner: Angelica Guevara**

**Discussion:**

Staff member Angelica Guevara presented the case to the Board.

Vice Chair Sandstrom:

- Confirmed with the architect that the building will feature painted masonry
- Commented that he liked the saw-tooth design on the roof, but suggested that it be made more regular with building,
- Suggested extending the roof out, giving it depth
- Expressed that he thought it was an attractive building

Boardmember Lambright:

- Liked chevron shapes on the building
- Suggested using raw block, instead of painted block, because peeling paint is unattractive
- Concerned about the mauve color in submitted elevations.
- Suggested more desert tones, maybe a more rust color, possibly an orange or a yellow, to compliment the gray of the building

Chairperson Paul:

- Chairperson Paul confirmed that the applicant is proposing to use more economical materials (metal buildings) because they are set so far back from the street and are blocked from view by the main building
- Liked the massing, scale, and height
- Liked the transition of varying rooflines

**Design Review Board – Work Session Minutes  
January 13<sup>th</sup>, 2015**

**Item A.4. DR15-005 Desert Arroyo Park**

9320 E. McKellips Road (60± acres) (District 5). Review of a proposed park. Zac Koceja, applicant; (PLN2015-00010)

**Staff Planner: Angelica Guevara**

**Discussion:**

Staff member Angelica Guevara presented the case to the Board.

Vice Chair Sandstrom:

- Concerned that the planned bollard lighting along the path would not produce enough light, and would create a safety concern
- Confirmed that there is a plant salvage plan in place at the site
- Could not confirm that the stone used in the gabion wall was native to the area
- Proposed that the metal shade structure to just be allowed to rust to blend in better with the desert

Boardmember Lambright:

- Inquired if larger trees could be placed on site (mix of 24" and 36" box trees)
- Suggested a galvanized material for the roof of the shade structure

Chairperson Paul:

- Confirmed with the applicant that the park will not have restrooms, due to the lack of perceived traffic and regional draw
- Confirmed that the park will be secured with lockable gates
- Confirmed that the driveway and parking lot will be paved with standard black asphalt
- Confirmed that there will be 5 total ramadas built for the project
- Confirmed that gabion walls will serve as benches at the site, and that the architect is filling the walls with grayish desert stone to blend with the desert
- Confirmed that a cantilevered design will be used for the ramada

**Design Review Board – Work Session Minutes**  
**January 13<sup>th</sup>, 2015**

- B. Call to Order  
On a motion by Boardmember Candland, seconded by Boardmember Lambright, the Board unanimously approved the December 9th, 2014 minutes.
- C. Discuss and take action on the following Design Review cases:

**Design Review Board – Work Session Minutes  
January 13<sup>th</sup>, 2015**

**Item A.4. DR14-039 Salad and Go**

245 South Power Road (District 5). Review of the proposed drive-thru restaurant with outdoor seating. Determine if the multiple colored bands proposed on the building provide commercial identification which constitute a sign or serve as architectural embellishment to the building. Sake H. Reindersma, SRA 360, applicant; Tony Christofellis, And Go Concepts, owner. (PLN2014-00587)

**Staff Planner: Kaelee Wilson**

**Staff Recommendation: Approval with Conditions**

**Board Decision: Continued to the February 10<sup>th</sup>, 2015 Meeting (Vote: 4-0,  
Absent: Boardmembers Roedel, Thompson, Banda)**



**Design Review Board – Work Session Minutes**  
**January 13<sup>th</sup>, 2015**

D.    Other Business  
      None.

E.    Adjournment  
      The Work Session concluded at 6:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Gildenstern  
Planning Assistant

mg